



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/542,517	04/03/2000	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS000061US1	4595

7590 10/09/2003

BRACEWELL & PATTERSON LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
PO BOX 969
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0969

EXAMINER

BLAIR, DOUGLAS B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 10/09/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/542,517	DUTTA, RABINDRANATH
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Douglas B Blair	2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-21 are currently pending in this application.
2. The amendment filed 7/25/2003 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: On page 17, the sentence reading: "The push engine transmits a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) cookie to the subscriber with an issue; and the status manager determines whether the issue has been opened by reference to a corresponding cookie response from the subscriber indicating that client software ahs been utilized to open the issue.".

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
4. Claims 1-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. On page 9 of the applicant's specification the applicant mentions the idea of distributing issues of electronic publication by pushing the issues to the clients; however there is no further elaboration anywhere within the specification regarding any details about the

electronic format of these issues. Such an omission of details is important because the disclosure provides no guidance to one skilled in the art about the format of an issue. For instance, on page 17 of the applicant's specification one of ordinary skill in the art would ask the following: How is a cookie packaged with the issue? How does the client detect that an issue has been opened? Such questions would prevent one skilled in the art from implementing the applicant's invention based on the applicant's disclosure without an undo burden of experimentation being placed on the person of ordinary skill trying to implement the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 7-10, and 14-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,850520 to Griebenow et al..

7. As to claim 15, Griebenow teaches a program product for efficiently transmitting a serial electronic publication from a server data processing system to subscribers (col. 1, lines 46-55), said program product comprising: a push engine that electronically transmits a first issue of a serial electronic publication from a server data processing system to a subscriber (col. 8, lines 19-32); and a status manager that determines whether the first issue has been opened by a subscriber (col. 8, lines 33-56, the receipt.), and the push engine transmits a second issue to the subscriber (col. 8, lines 19-32); and a computer usable medium encoding the push engine and the

Art Unit: 2142

status manager (col. 8, lines 19-56); however Giebenow does not explicitly teach allowing the transmission of a second issue only when it has been determined that the first issue is opened.

Giebenow does teach a status manager that determines whether a first advertisement has been opened by a subscriber and allows a push engine to transmit a second advertisement to the subscriber only after determining that the first advertisement has been opened (col. 10, lines 30-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Giebenow regarding processing receipts that indicate that a subscriber received a publication with the teachings of Giebenow regarding the distribution of advertisements because customizations applied to the advertisements could be applied to publications without departing from the scope of Giebenow's invention (Giebenow, col. 9, lines 5-11).

8. As to claim 16, Giebenow teaches a program product wherein a push engine transmits a first issue to a subscriber by transmitting a first issue to a client data processing system associated with the subscriber (col. 8, lines 19-56); a computer usable medium also encodes an input module that receives a status update from the subscriber (col. 8, lines 19-56); and a status manager determines whether a first issue has been opened by reference to the status update (col. 8, lines 19-56).

9. As to claim 17, Giebenow teaches a program product wherein a computer usable medium encodes instructions for allocating storage in a server data processing system for storing a subscriber status that corresponds to a status update (col. 8, lines 19-56); a status manager stores a subscriber status in a storage in response to receipt of the status update (col. 8, lines 19-56);

and a push engine determines whether a first issue has been opened by reference to subscriber status such that subscriber status enables the determination to be performed without communicating with a subscriber after a first issue has been transmitted (col. 8, lines 19-56).

10. As to claim 18, Giebenow teaches a program product wherein a server data processing system includes a timer that indicates when an advertisement time for initiating distribution of an advertisement related to a serial electronic publication has been reached (col. 10, lines 30-48); and a push engine determines whether a first advertisement has been opened in response to an indication of a timer (col. 10, lines 30-48).

11. As to claims 1-4 and 8-11, they feature the same limitations as claims 15-18 and are thus rejected on the same basis as claims 15-18.

12. As to claim 14, Griebeinow teaches a data processing system wherein a server data processing system includes a timer that indicates when a publication time for initiating distribution of an issue of a serial electronic publication has been reached (col. 8, lines 19-32); a status manager automatically transmits a status request to a subscriber in response to an indication of a timer (col. 8, lines 33-56, the renewal notice is a status request.); an input module receives a status reply from the subscriber that corresponds to a status request; and a status reply comprises a status update (col. 8, lines 33-56).

13. As to claim 7, it features the same limitation as claim 14 and is thus rejected on the same basis as claim 14.

14. Claims 5-6, 12-13, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,850520 to Griebeinow et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,141,010 to Hoyle.

Art Unit: 2142

15. As to claim 19, the teachings of Griebenow make claim 17 obvious; however Griebnow does not teach the use of http cookies.

Hoyle teaches a program product wherein a push engine transmits an http cookie to a subscriber with a first advertisement; a status update comprises a cookie response received from a subscriber; and a cookie response corresponds to an http cookie and indicates that the client software has been utilized to open a first advertisement (col. 17, lines 27-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art to combine the teachings of Griebenow regarding a system for publication distribution with the teachings of Hoyle regarding the use of cookies for status messages because a cookie is a commonly supported message type for transmitting status via the internet.

16. As to claim 20, the teachings of Griebenow make claim 17 obvious; however Griebnow does not teach the use of http functions.

Hoyle teaches a program product wherein a status update comprises an http function, received at a server data processing system, for storing a subscriber status at a server data processing system (col. 17, lines 27-45, a cookie is considered an http function.).

For reasons discussed in the rejection of claim 19 it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Griebenow regarding a system for publication distribution with the teachings of Hoyle regarding the use of an http function.

17. As to claim 21, Griebenow teaches a program product wherein a server data processing system includes a timer that indicates when a publication time for initiating distribution of an issue of a serial electronic publication has been reached (col. 8, lines 19-32); a status manager automatically transmits a status request to a subscriber in response to an indication of a timer

Art Unit: 2142

(col. 8, lines 33-56, the renewal notice is a status request.); an input module receives a status reply from the subscriber that corresponds to a status request; and a status reply comprises a status update (col. 8, lines 33-56).

18. As to claims 5-6 and 12-13, they feature the same limitations as claims 19-20 and are thus rejected on the same basis as claims 19-20.

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments filed 7/25/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues the following: (a) Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of questions that would be raised by one of ordinary skill in the art; (b) Nowhere in Griebenow is there any reference or suggestion of preventing a push of a next issue of a publication until after the first issue has been read; and (c) Hoyle also fails to teach or suggest the use of a cookie to provide status message about whether an issue has been opened on a client system.

20. As to point (a), The applicant has still not address how a cookie is packaged with the issue and how does the client detect that an issue has been opened. Though the capability of detecting whether an email has been opened is available, the applicant's specification does not specify that the issue is an email. The issue could be an attachment sent by email, in such case it would be unclear from the applicant's specification as to how one would detect that such an attachment has been opened.

21. As to point (b), for reasons discussed in the rejection of claim 1 though Griebenow does not explicitly teach detecting whether an issue has been read, Griebenow does detect whether an

advertisement has been read. An advertisement is considered an electronic publication and a sequence of advertisements could be considered issues of an advertisement.

22. As to point (c), the usage information sent to the server (col. 17, lines 35) is considered a status message and the advertisements are considered issues.

Conclusion

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patent Numbers 6,529,956 and 6,192,407 to Smith et al. teach a method for delivering documents to a user by first delivering a user an email which features a URL link documents that is unique to the user. When the user visits the URL, the delivery service will know the document has been opened by the user. U.S. Patent Number 6,460,036 to Herz describes a system for distributing publications based on computed potential user interest in the publications.

24. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2142

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas B Blair whose telephone number is 703-305-5267. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Powell can be reached on 703-305-9703. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3800.

Douglas Blair
September 16, 2003

DRB



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100